

Date: Tue, 24 May 94 04:30:11 PDT
From: Ham-Policy Mailing List and Newsgroup <ham-policy@ucsd.edu>
Errors-To: Ham-Policy-Errors@UCSD.Edu
Reply-To: Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu
Precedence: Bulk
Subject: Ham-Policy Digest V94 #220
To: Ham-Policy

Ham-Policy Digest Tue, 24 May 94 Volume 94 : Issue 220

Today's Topics:

 Code Test speeds (2 msgs)
 CW is fun!
 FCC understaffing problem
 Statistics on HAMS
 What *does* the FCC think? (was Re: Code test speeds)

Send Replies or notes for publication to: <Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu>
Send subscription requests to: <Ham-Policy-REQUEST@UCSD.Edu>
Problems you can't solve otherwise to brian@ucsd.edu.

Archives of past issues of the Ham-Policy Digest are available
(by FTP only) from UCSD.Edu in directory "mailarchives/ham-policy".

We trust that readers are intelligent enough to realize that all text
herein consists of personal comments and does not represent the official
policies or positions of any party. Your mileage may vary. So there.

Date: 23 May 94 21:04:29 GMT
From: news-mail-gateway@ucsd.edu
Subject: Code Test speeds
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In issue 219, Jeff (NH6IL) writes :

>> More than 95% can. Practice, practice, practice!

Sure, but why not try building a modem, instead of practising. I think this is
more positive!

>> What is it about USENET that makes people so mentally and physically lazy?

Nothing makes people more lazy, than old out-of-date stuff. Code *is* simply
out of date.

>>I wanted to be a commercial pilot but I couldn't pass the eye exam; I took

up sailing instead. Should I petition the FAA to delete the eye exam?

Nope, you cannot endanger other people's life by not knowing the code at 20wpm, while you can, if you are a commercial pilot with poor eyesight.

>> Computers can translate so why do we still see people learning foreign languages?

Simple, languages are a way to communicate with other people. I might not have a PhD in Literature, but I can still communicate in English. Should I stop talking, just because of this?

Amateur Radio is a hobby. And a multiple-choice one. Let's not focus only on code proficiency!

Best 73 de John SV1CEC

```
+-----+
| John Caradimas      | email: sv1cec@athnet.ath.forthnet.gr (home) |
| P.O.Box 31689       | jcaradim@gr.oracle.com (office) |
| Athens 100-35 GREECE | tel. : +(301)-6451541 (h) +(301)-8831511 (o) |
+-----+
|  DISCLAIMER : For all these, you can only blame me, nobody else! |
+-----+
```

Date: 23 May 94 11:25:11 -0600
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!sdd.hp.com!saimiri.primite.wisc.edu!news.doit.wisc.edu!
uwec.edu!hemp!whitemp@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: Code Test speeds
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

John Caradimas (jcaradim@gr.oracle.COM) wrote:

:
: In issue 219, Jeff (NH6IL) writes :
:
: >> More than 95% can. Practice, practice, practice!
:
: Sure, but why not try building a modem, instead of practising. I think this is
: more positive!
Want to and will.

:
: >> What is it about USENET that makes people so mentally and physically lazy?
:
: Nothing makes people more lazy, than old out-of-date staff. Code *is* simply

: out of date.

So is the bicycle, but it is still the most efficient way to get around.

And NO, the code ISN'T out of date. CW is still a fantastic way of using the radio spectrum efficiently - small bandwidth. Back to the bike: the bicycle is good as the amount of energy put into the system is returned at a high percentage in motion. The car (and motorcycle) is lame in that respect. CW is the same: efficiency in bandwidth. Ok, so some QSO's will take longer - but CW will also allow for some QSO's that would never happen because of QRN or what not.

: >>I wanted to be a commercial pilot but I couldn't pass the eye exam; I took up sailing instead. Should I petition the FAA to delete the eye exam?

:

: Nope, you cannot endanger other people's life by not knowing the code at 20wpm, while you can, if you are a commercial pilot with poor eyesight. How about hand signals for a car? Still out of date, but you still need them 'Just in case.'

:

: >> Computers can translate so why do we still see people learning foreign languages?

:

: Simple, languages are a way to communicate with other people. I might not have a PhD in Literature, but I can still communicate in English. Should I stop talking, just because of this?

:

: Amateur Radio is a hobby. And a multiple-choice one. Let's not focus only on code proficiency!

Er, we don't.

--

Mike White whitemp@cnsvox.uwec.edu
N9UXC Tech+ and climbing

Date: Mon, 23 May 1994 01:27:00 EST
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!agate!usenet.ins.cwru.edu!wariat.org!amcomp!
dan@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: CW is fun!
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

parickj4560@cobra.uni.edu writes:

>I have been licensed for 4 months now, got my Tech Jan 31,94 upgraded to

>General class Feb 24,94 and I have been there since. In my opinion, code is a
>n awesome thing to know. You can send messages to other people in a class room
>or you can impress people. How many people in the general public do you think
>just happen to know CW?

A Model-T is an awesome thing. As is a good horse. But I see no reason to
require a test of riding a horse for a drivers license.

>
> Anyway, if you are studying for your licenses, KEEP IT UP. It took me
>three long years of being interested in amateur radio before I cracked the
>code, now it's pretty much engraved in my brain. :-)

I am glad it worked for you. But then we know some people can pick it up
quickly, while others can not. And some can not at all. This does not
change the above in any way.

Dan N8PKV

--

"No free man shall ever be de-barred the use of arms. The strongest
reason for the people to retain their right to keep and bear arms is
as a last resort to protect themselves against tyranny in government."

-Thomas Jefferson

Date: 23 May 1994 10:40:47 -0400
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!swrinde!gatech!udel!news.sprintlink.net!rtp.vnet.net!
char2.vnet.net!not-for-mail@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: FCC understaffing problem
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

After a few FAXes to Congress Critters (I waited 11 weeks and 4 days)
the wait in WI got down to 3 weeks 3 days (N9VG0). Unfortunately -
since then they are stretching it out... and out... and out...

For whatever it is worth (soapbox on) I let the CW requirement keep
me out of ham radio for 40 years. I am a no-code and am putting a
little effort into getting a general so I can do HF digital. I must
say that I can detect little difference between CB and 80m except
there are fewer 4 letter words on 80m. On the repeaters we exchange
more that RST and weather! Usually the only time the equipment is
discussed is when someone is having a problem or contemplating a new
purchase. (soapbox off)

Dave Barrow, exe02594@vnet.net
N9UNR - Uninformed New Racheljaw
N9UNR @ WA9POV.#MKE.WI.USA.NA

Date: 23 May 94 00:18:43 GMT
From: news-mail-gateway@ucsd.edu
Subject: Statistics on HAMS
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

>Just curious. Have there been any recent studies on the amateur radio
>population as far as the following...
>I think that would make for some interesting reading. I've thought

some of this could be gotten off the CD Roms out there...

>of taking up an informal survey here on Internet but, IMO, the population
>here does not represent the average radio amateur.

i agree...

there was that ARRL survey not too long ago -- did that cover any of this and
are they willing to share?

bill wb9ivr
rockwell avionics/collins

Date: 23 May 1994 16:43:41 GMT
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!agate!cat.cis.Brown.EDU!NewsWatcher!user@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: What *does* the FCC think? (was Re: Code test speeds)
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <2rgane\$elb@chnews.intel.com>, cmoore@ilx018.intel.com (Cecil A.
Moore -FT-~) wrote:

> I can see the day coming when the FCC takes away some of our frequencies
> _BECAUSE_ we are wasting them on an old obsolete mode of communications
> like a bunch of ten-year-old boy scouts. In my opinion, Morse code is
> the biggest dumbing down influence in amateur radio today. Gary Coffman
> hit the nail on the head when he used the term, "idiot savants".
>
> 73, KG7BK, CecilMoore@delphi.com

Cecil,

Isn't the total spectrum used for HF CW less than 2MHz worth of
bandwidth? Not very significant when you come right down to it.

Tony

--

== Tony Pelliccio, KD1NR
== Anthony_Pelliccio@brown.edu, Tel. (401) 863-1880 Fax. (401) 863-2269
== The opinions above are my own and not those of my employer.

Date: 23 May 1994 10:12:55 -0400
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!swrinde!gatech!udel!news.sprintlink.net!rtp.vnet.net!
char2.vnet.net!not-for-mail@network.ucsd.edu
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <9405171643.AA13021@GRSEQ1.gr.oracle.com>, <CpyE92.4n7@world.std.com>,
<RFM.94May18134613@urth.eng.sun.com>or-ma
Subject : Re: What *does* the FCC think? (was Re: Code test speeds)

Richard McAllister (rfm@urth.eng.sun.com) wrote:
: In article <SR0.94May17235139@media-lab.media.mit.edu> sro@media.mit.edu (Shawn
O'Donnell) writes:

: >I wish they[code requirement supporters]d consider what the code obsession
: >does for our image on M Street. Honestly, have you ever heard someone from
: >the FCC talk about what they think about the importance of the code?

: The worst effect of the code requirements now is the mis-application of
: resources it causes. Whether incentive licensing is or was ever a good idea
: or not, I think it's clear it does work as an incentive. People who
: otherwise would never have spent time acquiring and improving their Morse
: skills are doing so. Since most people have only a limited amount of time
: and energy to put into a hobby, by rewarding people for studying code, we're

: A message here seems to be that those of us who favor the de-emphasis of
: code should be spending our time attempting to convince other hams, and in
: getting new hams in through the no-code paths, not in petitioning the FCC.

Rich,

Has it occurred to you that it might not be the "overwhelming"
opinion of the ham community - Just those who sit on the Board of
the ARRL?

Dave Barrow, exe02594@vnet.net
N9UNR@WA9POV.#MKE.WI.USA.NA

Date: 23 May 1994 10:29:27 -0400
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!library.ucla.edu!europa.eng.gtefsd.com!darwin.sura.net!udel!
news.sprintlink.net!rtp.vnet.net!char2.vnet.net!not-for-mail@network.ucsd.edu

To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <RFM.94May18134613@urth.eng.sun.com>,
<1994May19.103347.2562@ke4zv.atl.ga.us>, <1994May19.202632.3688@mixcom.mixcom.com>
Subject : Re: What *does* the FCC think? (was Re: Code test speeds)

kevin jessup (kevin.jessup@mixcom.mixcom.com) wrote:

: In <1994May19.103347.2562@ke4zv.atl.ga.us> gary@ke4zv.atl.ga.us (Gary Coffman)
writes:

: >>They're not unaffected by politics -- why should they stir up trouble.

: >This is key, they now see amateur radio as trouble. I think they're
: >ready to write us off as a bunch of *preservationists* of obsolete
: >technique.

: I tend to agree. I'm afraid we (as a whole) are acting less and less
: professional and are, in fact, just one small step beyond citizen's band.

: There was a time when radio amateurs were almost as knowledgable as
: practicing broadcast engineers. Back then electronics WAS radio, and
: nothing else. No digital, no computers, no data protocols and no
: "odd" forms of modulation.

: It is difficult enough for one to remain competent in ONE small area
: of electrical engineering. We cannot be experts at everything. Most
: amateurs are not even experts at RF. Radio is evolving beyond just RF
: but the amateur radio community seems incapable of accepting that.
: IMO, we need a broader and general "systems level" understanding of ALL
: aspects of RF communication.

: Despite the FCC possibly considering us "a bunch of *preservationists* of
: obsolete technique", and despite my own "technical" ramblings in r.r.a.p.
: about our demise and our utter lack of technical leadership, there is one
: aspect of amateur radio that I strongly agree with and feel we need to
: impress upon the government/FCC...

: The airwaves belong to the people, NOT the government and big business.
: We must continue to have FREE access to the airwaves on ALL bands using
: all modes available. Not because of our technical abilities, but to
: keep freedom of speech (including caustic talk/debate about the president,
: gun control, media control, health care, jobs, name-your-topic) alive
: across county, state and national borders. When the government
: takes RF away (or slowly squeezes us out) we will have more problems
: than just the loss of spectrum!

: Perhaps we should all write to the FCC and our congress critters
: about that!

```

:  --
:  /'-_          kevin.jessup@mixcom.com | Vote Libertarian!
:  {      }/      |
:  \      /      N9SQB, ARRL, Amateur Radio | Call 1-800-682-1776
:  |__*|      N9SQB @ WA9POV.#MKE.WI.USA.NA | for more information.

```

Kevin,

I think that there is an international agreement that restricts the <30MHz to those that have demonstrated CW - but I think the wpm is a lot less than the current requirement.

The REAL problem is the commercial DEMAND for all of the spectrum that we are occupying - and the FCC/Congress have found out that they can get M\$s for the license (Irealize that it is too much to expect that the "extra" \$s would be used to balance the budget - but it will probably be used to teach parents NOT to discipline their childern ...). We need to make SURE that our "Congress Critters" (love it) KNOW that we want the space, that we'll use the space, and that we will 'vacate' THEIR space if they take it away. I find FAX gets more attention - and is cheaper than - U S Snail

73 de Dave Barrow, exe02594@vnet.net
N9UNR@WA9POV.#MKE.WI.USA.NA

```

-----
Date: 23 May 94 20:24:20 GMT
From: unix.sri.com!headwall.Stanford.EDU!abercrombie.Stanford.EDU!
paulf@hplabs.hpl.hp.com
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

```

References <051894181437Rnf0.78@amcomp.com>,
<1994May20.131728.26636@cs.brown.edu>, <1994May22.223426.4010@ke4zv.atl.ga.us>
Subject : Re: Code test speeds

gary@ke4zv.atl.ga.us (Gary Coffman) writes:

```

>The only "practice" involved with Morse Code is the practice required to
>program the wetware. The Code speed exam has little or nothing to do with
>operating an amateur radio station.

```

I was wondering how long it would take you to come up with a response to the operations argument. Not a very good one, but something.

If a substantiation portion of HF operations involve CW, then it does indeed have something to do with operating an amateur radio station on HF. It does, by the only metric we have so far (38% in active use). Therefore your contention is false by counterexample.


```

-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|
Tenth USENET Anniversary|          \          |          /          |          PBY Catalina
Commemorative Signature|          (o)  --  _  |  --  (o)  -----
-----|          |          /  \  _I  /  \          |          |
--Paul Flaherty, PhD, N9FZX|          |          \|/000\|          |          |
paulf@Stanford.EDU        |          (v)          /  \  /  \          |          (v)
-----|          |          \|_V_  /          |          |

```

```
--
--Paul Flaherty, N9FZX | "The Enemy of the Good is the Better."
->paulf@Stanford.EDU | -- Gen. William "Wild Bill" Donovan
```

Date: Mon, 23 May 1994 19:31:09 GMT
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!swrinde!gatech!concert!hearst.acc.Virginia.EDU!cscsun!
dtiller@network.ucsd.edu
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <4ewwLc1w165w@voxbox.norden1.com>,
<1994May13.145055.1@ttd.teradyne.com>, <2r6lov\$21p@eram.esi.com.au>;
Subject : Re: Was this a bad idea?

Dave Horsfall (dave@eram.esi.com.au) wrote:

```
: [ Note followup ]
: Let's distinguish between transmitting out of band (OK) and having the
: ability to transmit out of band (annoys the authorities). Those who argue
: that a life was saved as a result should probably support issuing 2m
: hand-helds to all citizens - they might be able to use them one day, but
: in the meantime we'll trust them to not misuse this privilege.
```

That's exactly how it works over here - anyone can walk into a store that sells ham equipment and buy anything without a license. In essence we're doing just what you (in jest) suggest. The burden of responsibility falls on the owner of the radio instead of limiting purchases to hams only. I'd probably not be a ham if I hadn't bought an old HF rig to listen first.

David Tiller	Network Administrator	Voice: (804) 752-3710
dtiller@rmc.edu n2kau/4	Randolph-Macon College	Fax: (804) 752-7231
Brady Law critique removed	P.O. Box 5005	ICBM: 37d 42' 43.75" N
due to liberal PC pressure.	Ashland, Va 23005	77d 31' 32.19" W

Date: 23 May 1994 11:08:01 -0600
From: mnemosyne.cs.du.edu!nyx10.cs.du.edu!not-for-mail@uunet.uu.net
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <1994May19.102423.2447@ke4zv.atl.ga.us>, From ham-policy-relay@ucsd.edu
Mon May 23 11:37:59 1994
Received: from network.ucsd.edu by ucsd.edu; id LAA18227
sendmail 8.6.9/UCSD-2.2-sun via ESMTP
Mon, 23 May 1994 11:37:58 -0700 for <ham-policy-digest@ucsd.edu>
Received: from localhost by network.ucsd.edu (8.6.4/UCSDGENERIC.4)
id LAA06280 to ham-policy-digest@ucsd.edu; Mon, 23 May 1994 11:29:10 -0700
Received: from USENET by network.ucsd.edu with netnews
for ham-policy-digest@ucsd.edu (ham-policy@ucsd.edu);
contact usenet@network.ucsd.edu if you have questions.
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu
Date: 23 May 1994 17:34:31 GMT
Message-ID: <2rqpf7\$fif@chnews.intel.com>
Organization: Intel Corp., Chandler AZ.
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!swrinde!gatech!howland.reston.ans.net!sol.ctr.columbia.edu!
news.kei.com!ssd.intel.com!chnews!cmoore@network.ucsd.edu
Sender: ham-policy-relay@ucsd.edu
References: , <Anthony_Pelliccio-230594124631@138.16.64.55>h
Subject: Re: What *does* the FCC think? (was Re: Code test speeds)

Tony Pelliccio (Anthony_Pelliccio@brown.edu) wrote:
: Isn't the total spectrum used for HF CW less than 2MHz worth of
: bandwidth? Not very significant when you come right down to it.
: == Tony Pelliccio, KD1NR

Tony, my rule book says that CW is the only mode allowed on _all_
amateur frequencies and the only mode uniquely singled out for
testing purposes. The most obsolete mode has the highest priority
in all of amateur radio. The Federal Government is likely to use
that as an excuse to eliminate amateur radio as an obsolete function
left over from the cave man days of radio. I predict that Morse code
has been and will continue to be the single most important ingredient
in the destruction of modern amateur radio.

QEX says, "it's time to retire RTTY, AMTOR and packet... for our HF
digital communication." Too bad they didn't include the most obsolete
digital mode of all.

73, KG7BK, CecilMoore@delphi.com

End of Ham-Policy Digest V94 #220
